		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summ	narv	10/642,846	SELLERS ET AL.
	iary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Tiffany A. Fetzner	2859
All Participants:		Status of Application: <u>am</u>	<u>ended</u>
(1) <u>Tiffany A. Fetzner</u> .		(3)	
(2) Joseph M. Butscher Reg. No. 48,326.		(4)	
Date of Interview: 23 January 2006		Time: <u>8:30 am</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	☐ Applica Ì No	nt's representative)	
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: None			
Claims discussed: claims 1. 12, and 16 were discussed			
Prior art documents discussed: None			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview 			
did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.			
(Examiner/SPE Signature)	(Applicant	/Applicant's Representative S	ignature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative to discuss the reinsetion of the word comprising into claim 1 where neded by examiner's amendment, because applicant's November 21st 2005 amendment and response inadvertently removed the comprising which is needed so that claim 1 makes grammatical sense. Additionally claim 12 was discussed in order to correct the dependency. Since a dependent claim cannot depend from a canceled claim. Claim 16 was also discussed since this claim was previously canceled with the April 8th 2005 response, and incorrectly idetified in the November 21st 2005 response as an "original" claim as opposed to its correct status as a canceled claim. The examiner was thanked for her help, and given permission to amend claims 1 and 12, and 16 by examiner's amendment in order to place the application in condition for allowance.